

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/010,530	12/05/2001	Hiroshi Furukawa	P/2238-34	8001	
7590 04/24/2006			EXAMINER		
STEVEN I. WEISBURD, ESQ.			LIOU, JONATHAN		
DICKSTEIN, SHAPIRO, MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP 1177 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
41th FL.	OF THE AMERICAS		2616		
NEW YORK, NY 10036-2714			DATE MAILED: 04/24/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

A
$\overline{}$

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Applicant(s)		
FURUKAWA, HIROSHI		
Art Unit		
2663		

	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jonathan Liou	2663				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>06 April 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP		•				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff ptice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
a) \square The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date			·			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire in	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejecti	on.			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).	- · · · · - · · · · - · · · · · · · · ·				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th				
AMENDMENTS	•					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause			
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in belappeal; and/or 	• •	ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		Const. Class and a second	t			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will vided below or appended.	ll be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed:	•					
Claim(s) objected to: <u>6,7,12,13 and 17</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5,8-11,14-16 and 18-20</u> .						
Claim(s) rejected. <u>1-5,6-77,74-76 and 76-20</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		,				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	ned.			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See cont note	it does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).						
13. Other:						
		MODE				
		FICKY Q. NO	iO			

HICKY Q. NGO SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER On page 3 of the remarks, Applicants argues Wallentin reference does not teach "relay node list held by the node, as a pair, ID information on said terminal station and a relay source node included in the uplink packet transmitted by said terminal station in each of said core node and said relay node" recited in claim 1. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Wallentin teach mobile stations sends a registration message to the associated network (col 6, lines 3-4.), which is uplink transmission from mobile terminal to Base station (relay node) and core node (See Fig. 2.) The routing areas includes different routes, which inherently includes a relay source node in the packet for starting the routing areas (col 6, lines 10-12., Fig. 3) Therefore, Wallentin teach a relay source node included in the up-link packet transmitted by terminal station in each of core node and relay node. Wallentin teach the network stores the routing area identification number where the mobile station last registered (See col 6, lines 14-16.) The network could be core node (core network) or relay node (relay network or merely base station.) Therefore, Wallentin teach relay node list held by the node, as a pair, ID information on said terminal station recited in the claim 1. Examiner interpreted base station as relay nodes. While the mobile station register the information, the routing area includes the pathes as shown in Fig. 3. Furthermore, a relay node list does not clearly define in the independent claims 1, 18-20. Thus, examiner interpreted routing area in Wallentin's reference as a relay node list as claimed.